DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 790 SO 018 060

AUTHOR Flamer, Mary Guess; Dougherty, John
TITLE The Implementation of Family Life Education in New Jersey Public Schools. A Report.
INSTITUTION New Jersey State Dept. of Education, Trenton.
PUB DATE Jan 86
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Evaluation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Family Life Education; Program Attitudes; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Public Schools; *Required Courses; State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS *New Jersey

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes information about Family Life Education (FLE) as mandated by the New Jersey Board of Education. The information is taken from a variety of sources and three principal concerns of the state board are analyzed: (1) the status of implementation of family life education; (2) local district perceptions of training needs; and (3) the availability of curricular models which interested districts might study and adopt or adapt. The report concludes with a summary of major findings in seven areas: (1) Organization of Instruction: Of the 354 districts surveyed 47 percent combine separate and interdisciplinary instruction methods; (2) Placement of FLE Instruction: Most districts begin FLE instruction in the lower primary grades and continue through grade 9; (3) Instructional Practices: Districts emphasize the FLE areas of family relationships, personal growth and development, and social relations; (4) Community Involvement: A high degree of community involvement, beyond the minimal requirement, is indicated by the inclusion of parents and the community in curriculum development and as sources for instructional resources; (5) Staff Training: More districts provide their own training, rather than acquiring it by other means; (6) Implementation Problems: Most districts report no problems in implementing the curricula. Some districts, however, perceive problems of inadequate staff knowledge, lack of materials, and insufficient time for staff training; and (7) Curriculum Models: A substantial number of New Jersey districts have confidence in the applicability of their own FLE programs and responded to a request for self-nomination and demonstration of fulfillment of established criteria. Three appendices are included: a "Family Life Education Implementation Profile Form," a "Family Life Self-Nomination Form," and a summary entitled "Highlights of a National Association of State Board of Education Study." (APG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED281790

A Report on the

Implementation of Family Life Education in New Jersey Public Schools

January 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jacqueline Cusack

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

New Jersey State Department of Education

225 West State Street
CN 500
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

SO018060

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A REPORT

ON THE

IMPLEMENTATION OF FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION

IN

NEW JERSEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Saul Cooperman
Commissioner

Joel Bloom
Assistant Commissioner

Prepared by
Mary Guess Flamer
John Dougherty

New Jersey State Department of Education
225 West State Street
CN 500
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

January, 1986

PTM 500.48

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

JOHN T. KLAGHOLZ President	Seaside Park
JAMES JONES Vice President	Teaneck
S. DAVID BRANDT	Cherry Hill
MAUD DAHME	Annandale
BETTY A. DEAN	East Orange
MATEO F. DeCARDENAS	Union City
ANNE S. DILLMAN	Perth Amboy
ALICE A. HOLZAPFEL	Elizabeth
ROBERT H. MARIK	Princeton
NANCY SCHAENEN	Madison
JAMES M. SEABROOK, SR	Bridgeton
DEBORAH P. WOLFE Representing the State Board of Higher Education	Cranford

Saul Cooperman, Commissioner of Education
Secretary

T. Edward Hollander, Chancellor of Higher Education
Ex-Officio

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION IN NEW JERSEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1980, the New Jersey State Board of Education adopted the requirement that New Jersey public schools provide instruction in Family Life Education (FLE), to begin no later than September, 1983. In 1985, the state board reviewed and re-adopted the FLE code for a five-year period. The code requires instruction in the four areas of interpersonal relationships, foundations of growth and human development, responsible personal behavior and establishment of strong family life; a local board policy and procedures regarding student excusal; and community involvement in curriculum development.

When it re-adopted the mandate, the state board requested a report on the implementation of FLE in the schools. This Report on the Implementation of Family Life Education in New Jersey Public Schools summarizes information from: the monitoring data available in county offices of education, the information on formal petitions to the commissioner and state board regarding FLE, a recent review of implementation in a large sample of local districts, and a process whereby local districts could voluntarily nominate their own programs as worthy of review and replication. The information has been analyzed with regard to the three principal concerns of the state board: the status of implementation of FLE, local district perceptions of training needs, and the availability of curriculum models which interested districts might study and adopt or adapt.

The report concludes with a summary of the major findings, which are as follows:

- Organization of Instruction

  School districts may teach FLE in the following manner: as a separate course of instruction in which content is taught at a certain time, at regular intervals; as an interdisciplinary instructional approach in which the content is integrated into other subjects; or as a combination of both of these approaches.

  Of the 354 districts profiled in the study, 47 percent have a combination of separate and interdisciplinary instruction for FLE, and 37 percent use only an interdisciplinary method of instruction. Of the 47 percent that combine the two, most districts use a predominantly interdisciplinary course of instruction. Health education and, secondly, science are the most widely used courses in which FLE instruction occurs.

- Placement of FLE Instruction

  Most districts begin instruction in FLE in the lower primary grades and continue through grade nine with a lessening of emphasis in later years.

- Instructional Practices

  Most districts emphasize the FLE areas of family relationships, personal growth and development, and social relations. This indicates that the districts not only closely follow the recommendations in the FLE guidelines, but they choose to place FLE in a context of interpersonal relationships. Significant numbers of districts do not perceive a need to improve their programs.

- Community Involvement

  A high degree of community involvement is indicated by the inclusion of parents and community in both curriculum development and as instructional resources in FLE. Most districts have gone beyond the minimal requirement.

- Staff Training

  More districts provide their own training, rather than acquiring it by other means. For slightly more than half, no training needs are reported. For the remainder, there are training needs in a variety of topics, including awareness and prevention of child abuse and neglect, curriculum development, and drugs and alcohol abuse, as well as training for new staff and retraining for continuing staff.

- Implementation Problems

  Most districts report no problems in implementing the curricula. Some districts, however, perceive problems of inadequate staff knowledge, lack of materials, and insufficient time for staff training.

- Curriculum Models

  Forty-six districts responded to a request for self-nomination, demonstrating fulfillment of established criteria. This indicates that substantial numbers of New Jersey districts have confidence in the quality and applicability of their own FLE programs and are willing to serve as models for other districts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MONITORING DATA	1
III.	CONTROVERSIES AND DISPUTES	2
IV.	IMPLEMENTATION PROFILE	2
V.	PROMISING PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES IN FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION PROGRAMS	11
VI.	SUMMARY	17
APPENDICES		19
	APPENDIX A. Family Life Education Implementation Profile Form	20
	APPENDIX B. Family Life Education Self-Nomination Form	23
	APPENDIX C. Highlights of the National Association of State Boards of Education Study	26

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1980, the New Jersey State Board of Education adopted the Family Life Education (FLE) mandate, N.J.A.C. 6:29-7.1, which required the teaching of interpersonal relations, human sexuality and development, decision making, and family life in New Jersey public school districts; a student excusal policy and procedures; and community involvement in curriculum development. These requirements were to be fully implemented by September, 1983.

At the March 6, 1985, meeting, the state board reviewed and re-adopted the FLE code. At that time, the state board requested a report on the implementation of the mandate.

The board's request focused on the following issues, which are addressed in this report:

- What is the status of implementation of FLE in local school districts?
- What needs do district personnel perceive for teacher training?
- Are there curriculum models in some local districts which can be recommended to help interested districts improve their own FLE programs?

This report answers the state board's questions and is organized in the following sections:

1. information from the monitoring process carried out by county offices of education;
2. information regarding any formal petitions to the state board and the commissioner;
3. implementation profiles of FLE programs in New Jersey school districts; and
4. a listing of local FLE programs which have met established criteria, together with a description of the process by which they were identified.

The report concludes with a summary of findings, followed by detailed appendices, including the data collection instruments and the highlights of a study of FLE in New Jersey prepared under the auspices of the National Association of State Boards of Education.

II. MONITORING DATA

The curricular aspects of the FLE mandate are monitored as a part of the monitoring responsibilities of the county offices. The item in the monitoring guide which requires information on FLE is "Element 3: Comprehensive Curriculum/ Instruction." Indicator 3.1 specifically requests information on whether there is a written, board-approved curriculum, K-12, for all subjects included in all state-mandated programs and services. Indicator 3.2 requests information on whether that curriculum has been implemented.

The Division of County and Regional Services reports that 382 districts were monitored between January, 1984, and the present. Of those, all had met the standards required by Indicators 3.1 and 3.2 pertaining to FLE.

III. CONTROVERSIES AND DISPUTES

The Bureau of Controversies and Disputes has to this point received no formal petition regarding the implementation of FLE. However, three cases have come before the commissioner and state board regarding seniority claims to FLE positions. In all three cases, it was determined that a board does not have to structure its FLE to accomodate seniority claims.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION PROFILE

To provide the additional information requested by the state board, a study of implementation was undertaken. The results are summarized within this section.

Design of the Study

To assess FLE implementation in New Jersey schools, a planning group of central staff and county staff developed a study design which included selecting a representative sample of at least 50 percent of all districts. The county offices were asked to complete implementation profiles (see Appendix A) on each district in the sample. In completing the profile, county staff were directed to report on those districts with which they were most knowledgeable and to seek supplemental data if necessary.

Specifically, the issues examined in the profile form were as follows:

1. fulfillment of the requirements of the mandate, which include a curriculum covering four instructional topic areas, an excusal policy and procedures for students, and community involvement in the FLE curriculum development;

2. the nature of program organization, whether separate, interdisciplinary, or a combination of both courses of instruction;

3. curricular areas through which FLE is taught in interdisciplinary programs;

4. grade levels at which the topic of human sexuality is taught;

5. hours of instruction per grade level per year;

6. topics covered in FLE in all schools;

7. methods for involving community members and groups;

8. staff training information, including topics, providers of training, dates of most recent training, and continuing staff training needs;

9. problems currently being encountered by districts in doing FLE; and

10. needed improvements in the FLE programs.

Survey Return Rate

Profiles were analyzed on 60 percent of New Jersey school districts, or 354 from a population of 593 operating school districts. The percentages of districts from each county represented in the survey are listed in the table below:

County	Percent of Districts Included in Study
Atlantic	48%
Bergen	52%
Burlington	50%
Camden	49%
Cape May	53%
Cumberland	38%
Essex	43%
Gloucester	48%
Hudson	92%
Hunterdon	72%
Mercer	73%
Middlesex	44%
Monmouth	85%
Morris	44%
Ocean	97%
Passaic	50%
Salem	50%
Sussex	74%
Union	43%
Warren	63%
Total New Jersey	60%

The representativeness of the sample is based on the degree to which the proportions of community types in the sample reflect the proportions for such types in the state. Community type is identified by the District Factor Grouping System, which has 12 categories. Group A is the lowest socioeconomic status, and J is the highest. District Factor Grouping V represents vocational schools, while District Factor Grouping Z represents school districts with less than 300 students. The following tabulation illustrates this relationship:

District Factor Group (DFG)	Districts in Sample	Sample Percent	Total State Percent
A	44	12.6	9.67
B	33	9.4	8.8
C	26	7.4	7.94
D	31	8.8	8.29
E	33	9.4	8.8
F	25	7.16	7.77
G	32	9.16	8.29
H	26	7.44	8.98
I	29	8.3	8.29
J	20	5.73	8.29
V	7	2.0	3.28
Z	43	12.3	11.22
Total	349*	100.0	100.0

*DFG data are missing for five districts in the sample.

Most of these categories are adequately represented in the sample. (Only DFG-V, Vocational Schools, is under-represented.) The sample, then, does reflect the larger population adequately.

Compliance Rate

The first issue addressed in the district profile form was compliance with the mandate. Of 354 districts in the sample, two were reported to be out of compliance, as follows: one district out of compliance in the areas of excusal policy, curriculum, parental notification, and community involvement; and one district only in parental notification. (It can be assumed that these two districts have not been monitored by their respective county offices, [see p.2].)

The student excusal policy and procedures which are part of the FLE mandate require local districts to excuse students from any portion of the curriculum upon the request of parents and to provide excused students with appropriate alternative educational activities. County staff report very few parental requests for excusal of students.

Program Organization

The curricular content of FLE may be taught at elementary and secondary levels in one of three types of organizational plans. They are:

1. Separate course - The content is taught at a certain time, at regular intervals, and is clearly labeled as the FLE course.

2. Interdisciplinary approach - The content is integrated into other subjects such as health, social sciences, home economics, and so forth. Teachers of these subjects include FLE in their materials and instruction.

3. Combination approach - There is a separate course at some grade levels, whether elementary or secondary, and, in the same district, an interdisciplinary approach at other levels.

Separate Course

The data indicated that 55 districts (15 percent of the sample) have separate FLE courses of instruction.

Interdisciplinary Approach

One hundred thirty-one districts (37 percent of the sample) reported an interdisciplinary approach. Districts which have an interdisciplinary program must arrange for the content to be taught within the context of one or more of the other subjects in their curriculum. County office staff were asked to indicate the subject(s) into which they had integrated FLE instruction. The tabulation of responses exceeds the total number of districts included in the sample, since districts have added FLE instruction to more than one curricular area. The following is a tabulation of responses.

Subject Areas	Districts Integrating FLE in Subject Areas
Health	297
Science	206
Social Studies	139
Physical Education	92
Home Economics	76
Other	48

As the above information indicates, health education is the subject area most widely used for teaching FLE. Science is second, and social studies a third choice.

Districts integrate FLE content by grades and subjects in the interdisciplinary approach, often infusing it into multiple curricular areas. The following table indicates the subject areas and grade placements the study found.

Subject Areas	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Total
Health	219	239	221	131	810
Science	124	150	116	35	425
Home Economics	13	29	53	34	129
Physical Education	48	59	62	33	202
Social Sciences	111	102	57	18	288
Other	27	21	12	15	75
Total	542	600	521	266	

The data indicate that, when FLE is taught as part of the health, science, or social science programs, a significant number of districts begin such

instruction in grades K to 3. Within the health program, more than half of the districts continue such instruction through the 12th grade. However, in the science and social science programs, FLE drops off significantly after the 9th grade.

A recent report of case studies of FLE in selected New Jersey school districts, independently published by the National Association of State Boards of Education, corroborates this survey data in regard to program organization and instructional practices. A summary of the case studies may be found in Appendix C.

Combination Programs

More districts (166 or 47.1 percent of the sample) deliver FLE through a combination approach than through either of the other forms of program organization. This inference is supported by the data in the table immediately above which shows various patterns of curricula integration by subjects and grade level.

Hours of Instruction

Another measure of the degree of implementation of FLE is the number of hours of instruction provided for students over the academic year. Respondents were asked to indicate the hours of instruction per year by grade level of all FLE programs in all profiled districts. The following are the results in ranges from minimum to maximum for each grade level. Averages were not computed because ranges are very wide.

Grade Level	Hours Per Year
K-3	5 - 50
4-6	10 - 130
7-9	5 - 40
10-12	13 - 30

The data show that most instruction in FLE is concentrated at the intermediate grade level, 4-6. Less time has been given to FLE in grades K-3 and 7-12. This is consistent with findings discussed above, especially in regard to integration of FLE instruction in other curricular areas. However, this information must be weighed with the fact that most districts have an interdisciplinary course of instruction and may not have considered FLE as a distinct subject.

Family Life Curricular Content

There is a broad range of possible content from which educators can choose in developing a FLE program. The Family Life Education Curriculum Guidelines, developed by the New Jersey Department of Education, suggests an array of 18 program objectives and 34 broad instructional topics for FLE. In selecting from this range, the district may emphasize some sub-topics over others. For example, social relationships may be emphasized over parenting skills.

The county office respondents were asked to indicate which of nine broad curricular topics are being taught and with what degree of emphasis within each local program. The nine headings are a synthesis of the topics provided in the education department's guidelines. The following are the results in numbers of districts teaching the topic under FLE and the degree of emphasis given to each topic. (It should be remembered that multiple topics are taught under the heading of FLE in local districts.)

	Degree of Emphasis			
	High		Low	
Family Life Topic	1	2	3	Total
Family Relationships	259	84	3	346
Personal Growth and Development	270	73	3	346
Social Relationships	211	128	6	345
Sexuality	100	205	39	344
Character Education	112	195	30	337
Problem-solving/Decision-making	164	157	25	346
Family Violence/Child Abuse	99	186	53	338
Parenting Skills	45	131	144	320
Family Planning	52	93	165	310
Other	41	42	9	92

It is clear that some topics are emphasized more than others. These data show that there is a hierarchy of instructional emphasis of sub-topics within the structure of FLE programs. Three topics are taught with greater emphasis in significant numbers of districts: personal growth and development (270 districts), family relationships (259 districts), and social relationships (211 districts). The indication is that these three are the most widely emphasized in current practice.

Six additional sub-topics are taught by significant numbers of districts with some (but not high) emphasis: sexuality (205 districts), character education (195 districts), family violence and child abuse (186 districts), problem-solving and decision-making (157 districts), parenting skills (131 districts), and social relationships (128 districts).

Two topics are taught but with low emphasis, as follows: family planning (165 districts) and parenting skills (144 districts).

Instruction in Human Sexuality

One of the most controversial aspects of the FLE mandate was the inclusion of human sexuality and development. Study data indicate that districts are providing instruction on this topic at the following grade levels:

Grade Level	No. Districts
K-3	68
4-6	233
7-9	257
10-12	132

Relatively few districts teach sexuality in the primary grades. Most districts, on the other hand, begin instruction before high school. Sixty-six percent begin such instruction in grades 4 to 6.

Community Involvement

By its nature and by law, FLE requires significant community involvement and input in curriculum development. The values of the community are the framework in which FLE is to be carried out. Districts can involve community members in developing the curriculum and/or include them as resource persons to provide information on a variety of subjects, both in the classrooms and to school staff. The study found community involvement to be almost evenly divided between the types of participation, as the table below indicates:

Type of Involvement	No. Cases
Curriculum Development	243
Resource Persons	251
Total	494

Many districts are involving the community in both aspects, since the total of reported cases exceeds the number of districts in the sample by 140.

The survey also yielded information about the kinds of professional persons being used by districts to enhance FLE. The following are the findings:

Type of Persons	No. Cases
Medical Professionals	257
Social Workers	175
Counselors	165
Others	138
Total	735

Most of the studied districts seem to be using more than one of the types in their community involvement efforts, since the total reported is more than twice the number of districts in the sample. Medical professionals, that is, doctors and nurses, far exceed the other choices. This is consistent with the finding that most programs teach FLE as part of their health education effort.

Staff Training

Because of the complexity of the issues to be covered in FLE and their unfamiliarity to many educators, the state board is concerned about any needs districts may have for training of administrative and teaching staff.

Recency of Training. In order to determine when training took place, the study asked about the recency of training programs. The results are as follows:

Years	Districts Offering Training
1980-1981	4
1981-1982	3
1982-1983	6
1983-1984	77
1984-1985	170
1985-1986	46
No date	43
No response	5
Total	354

These data indicate that 216 districts (61 percent of the sample) have had recent FLE training or will be having such training during the current school year. It can be concluded that most districts waited until full implementation was required before providing training (i.e., 1983-84).

Training Topics. Training programs in FLE can cover a wide range of topics. Study data indicate the following as topics of all of the reported FLE training programs:

Training Topic	Districts Offering Training
District Curriculum	94
Child Abuse	35
Human Sexuality	30
State Guidelines	13
Personal Relations	11
Marriage and the Family	10
Drug and Alcohol	7
Curriculum Materials	6
Human Development	6
Sexual Abuse	5
Suicide Prevention	4
Affirmative Action	2
Community Relations	2
Death and Dying	2
No topic listed	53

The array of topics covered was broad as the table shows. Frequently the topic covered was the district curriculum (26.7 percent), indicating that staff were trained in the FLE program that had been developed by the school district.

The issue of whether in-service courses were provided by district staff or outside experts was also of interest and relevance to the assessment of training needs. Five of the types of training providers are listed below. "Public or private agency" includes organizations such as Planned Parenthood

or the Division of Youth and Family Services. The Department of Education as a training group includes field units and central office staff. Results are as follows:

Training Agent	Cases
District Staff	120
College Courses	60
Public or Private Agency	52
Department of Education	38
Combination of the above	27
No response	56
Total	353

The most common approach was to staff the training program with district personnel, probably for reasons of both economy and timelines. There are many staff members in New Jersey school districts well-qualified in regard to FLE. These include health, social sciences, and science teachers, in addition to counselors, nurses, and others. The responses did not clearly cite the training that occurred between 1980 and 1982 by the educational improvement centers, in which more than 300 people participated.

County office respondents were also asked to indicate components of FLE in which they feel that there are local needs for further training. The results are as follows:

Further Training Needed	Districts
None	182
Retraining in FLE	51
Child Abuse	28
New Staff	18
Curriculum Materials	14
Drugs and Alcohol	9
Human Sexuality	5
Networking	2
Parenting Skills	1
Sexual Abuse	1
No Response	43
Total	354

For slightly more than half of the sample, no further training needs for district staff were reported. For 14 percent, there are needs for general retraining, and for 35 percent, training in the specific topics as listed.

Implementation Problems

Since FLE is a relatively new area of instruction for many districts, staff and community reactions to the program are important. In addition, implementation may be difficult to assess because of the broad range of potential content and teaching methods. County respondents were asked to

indicate problems of implementation districts may have encountered. The table below indicates the results:

Implementation Problem	Cases
No Problems	290
Inadequate staff knowledge	16
Lack of materials	9
Time for staff training	8
Program implementation	7
Staff discomfort with sensitive subjects	4
Inadequate curriculum guide/outline	3
Need for resource people	2
Community resistance	1
Insufficient instructional time	1
Total	341

Most districts profiled in the sample (81.9 percent) are not currently experiencing problems in implementing programs of FLE. The remainder perceive problems with staff knowledge, instructional materials, time for staff training, and the general implementation difficulties which can accrue to any new program.

Needed Improvements

Respondents were asked to recommend any specific changes which might improve the local programs in the district. The following are the results:

Improvement Recommended	Responses
None needed	192
More staff training	38
Improve implementation	30
More materials and resources	27
Multiple problems	17
Improve scheduling	16
More community involvement	14
Need a K-12 curriculum	10
Additional staff	6
Change state guidelines	2
Total	352

Fifty-four percent of the profiled districts are reported to need no improvements in their FLE programs. For 46 percent, improvements are recommended, most of them focusing on curriculum content. From the contrast of these data with those reported in the table on implementation problems, it can be concluded that some districts would find improvements desirable even though they currently perceive no problems in implementation.

V. PROMISING PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES IN FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION

The implementation profiles yielded some information about FLE programs and practices across the state, but further information was needed to identify

those programs worthy of study and possible adoption by other districts. A process was designed for this purpose, through cooperative planning by staff of the county offices and the Division of General Academic Education. The process and the results are summarized below.

The Process of Self-Nomination

New Jersey school districts which judge their own programs as exemplary were invited to participate in the following process:

- examine criteria established for FLE program models;
- apply the criteria to their own programs;
- choose whether to submit a program description on a self-nomination form, appending supporting documentation; and
- forward the materials to their respective county offices.

Following self-nomination, county offices reviewed the information submitted and forwarded the materials to the Division of General Academic Education. The resulting list of 46 local FLE programs may be found on page 15 of this report.

Criteria for Self-Nomination. Eligibility for self-nomination was based on fulfilling of the FLE code requirements and additional, more exacting standards. A letter of invitation, a description of the criteria, and the self-nomination form (see Appendix B) were sent to all districts. Districts electing to participate were given a month to respond.

The criteria for program self-nomination were as follows:

1. Comprehensiveness in Four Required Areas of the FLE Mandate

   The code definition of FLE includes four major areas of instructional concentration: interpersonal relationships; foundations of human growth and development; responsible personal behavior; and establishment of strong family life. Every K-12 district must have a program at the elementary and secondary levels. The selection of the particular grade level(s) is left to local district discretion. The curriculum can be developed with an interdisciplinary approach or as a separate course of instruction. It should also demonstrate that all topics are covered in greater detail as the students progress by age and grade level.

2. Variety of Instructional Strategies

   The curriculum should include different methods of instruction in order to provide both challenge and success for the students. As an example of different methods of instruction, the code indicates that resource persons from the community may be used to augment the curriculum.

3. Logical Scope and Sequence of the Curriculum

The information and materials to be covered in the curriculum should be presented in a manner that is appropriate to the age and development of the child.

4. Clarity and Suitability of Student Outcomes

The goals and objectives of the instruction and how these goals and objectives will affect or change student behavior should be clearly defined.

5. Parent and Community Involvement

The New Jersey Administrative Code 6:27-7.1(b) mandates that:

> The family life education curriculum shall be developed through appropriate consultation and participation of teachers, school administrators, parents and guardians, pupils in grades 9 through 12, community members, physicians, members of the clergy and representative members of the community. The local school district shall demonstrate prior to the initiation of any local school district program that the above consultation shall be continued as the program is revised in future years.

While the local district can determine how best to involve these groups, the district must demonstrate that it has included community involvement, consultation, and participation in the development of its FLE curriculum. Community involvement should be ongoing.

6. Continuous Inservice for Teachers

The adoption of FLE affects other courses in the curriculum and affects teachers in virtually every discipline. It is, therefore, essential that all members of the faculty have some knowledge of the program. Teachers assigned to teach a designated unit in FLE need more than a general knowledge of the subject. In-service may take the form of concentrated workshops, periodic seminars, or regularly scheduled after-school sessions.

7. Evaluation Component for FLE

Procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of FLE should be an integral part of the curriculum. If available, results of the evaluation and the strategies for changing and improving the curriculum and/or program should be included. The code indicates that parents and community should be involved in the revision process.

8. Ease of Replication

   Districts have chosen a variety of ways to implement their FLE. Some of these measures may have required resources which would not be possible for other districts to duplicate, for example, sizeable board appropriations, outside financial support, or intensive in-service training. Self-nominated programs should include elements that can be adopted practically by other districts.

The criteria used for selecting the programs are not validation criteria for exemplary programs, but are selection criteria to provide all New Jersey school districts with good examples of various ways to implement, enhance, and improve their existing programs.

Program Descriptions

Once the districts determined that they met the criteria, they were to complete a two-page questionnaire, the Family Life Education Self-Nomination Form (see Appendix B), which required a general overview of the program. The districts were to respond to the following questions or statements:

1. Indicate the approximate number of children participating in the FLE program.

2. Give the grade level of the students participating in the program.

3. Is the FLE curriculum taught as a separate course of instruction; an interdisciplinary course of instruction; or a combination of both?

4. What alternative programming is provided for excused students?

5. Indicate the type(s) and frequency of in-service training and additional education provided for staff directly and indirectly involved with the FLE curriculum.

6. Indicate the certification categories of teachers teaching FLE.

7. Identify the key factors that you consider to be responsible for the successful implementation of your FLE curriculum.

8. Indicate any unique qualities or characteristics of your program.

9. After reviewing the criteria, indicate the criteria that have been met.

10. If the curriculum did not meet all of the established criteria, indicate the noteworthy qualities of the program which should be considered.

The last two questions were included to allow school districts to nominate their programs on the basis of particular noteworthy qualities, even though not all of the criteria may have been fulfilled.

Programs Nominated

Forty-six FLE programs were submitted for consideration, all characterized by exemplary features which could serve as resources for other districts. The programs are identified below:

Allendale, Bergen
Bayonne, Hudson
Berkeley Township, Ocean
Clark, Union
Clearview Regional, Gloucester
Cumberland Regional, Cumberland
East Brunswick, Middlesex
Edison, Middlesex
Fort Lee, Bergen
Franklin Township, Gloucester
Hamilton Township, Mercer
Hardyston Township, Sussex
Hillsdale, Bergen
Hopatcong, Sussex
Irvington, Essex
Jersey City, Hudson
Leonia, Bergen
Linden, Union
Montgomery Township, Somerset
Montvale, Bergen
Moorestown, Burlington
Morris, Morris
North Plainfield, Somerset
Northern Valley, Bergen
Paramus, Bergen
Pascack, Bergen
Passaic City, Passaic
Paterson, Passaic
Pequannock, Morris
Pompton Lakes, Passaic
Randolph, Morris
Ridgewood, Bergen
River Vale, Bergen
Stanhope, Sussex
Stillwater Township, Sussex
Stockton, Hunterdon
Spotswood, Middlesex
Springfield Township, Burlington
Sussex County Vocational Technical, Sussex
Teaneck, Bergen
Waldwick, Bergen
Washington Township, Morris
Washington Township, Warren
Wildwood, Cape May
Woodbridge, Middlesex
Woodcliff Lakes, Bergen

Proposed Publication of Selected Program Descriptions

The Division of General Academic Education is currently developing a publication on promising programs and practices in FLE in New Jersey school districts. The purpose of the proposed publication is to provide information about program models which have proven effective, to describe examples of local solutions to problems of implementation, and to disseminate a listing of school districts which can serve as resources to others seeking assistance in program improvement. The publication is projected for summer 1986.

Approximately 17 programs will be described in the booklet, all to be drawn from among the 46 districts listed above. These 17 programs will be selected to reflect a balance in geographic distribution and in instructional strategies, as well as fulfillment of the self-nomination criteria. Specifically, each category is as follows:

1. Geographic Distribution - The districts will be balanced appropriately within the service areas of the Regional Curriculum Services Units, north, central and south. Programs to be included in the booklet will also reflect urban, suburban, and rural school communities.

2. Instructional Strategy - An even distribution of separate, interdisciplinary, and combination types of instruction will be sought, since FLE can be taught in any of these three modes.

3. Fulfillment of the Criteria - The first round of programs will be selected based on whether they have met all of the criteria, with additional programs selected on the basis of particular noteworthy qualities.

VI. Summary

The intent of this analysis was to ascertain the degree of implementation of FLE in New Jersey school districts and to identify curriculum models as possible resources for school districts that need and wish to improve their own FLE programs. The mandate in FLE has been in effect since 1980, with the requirement for full implementation dating from 1983. The information provided by the study is, therefore, drawn from approximately two and one-half years of implementation experience with FLE. It does demonstrate the extent to which school districts have implemented a mandate.

The major findings of the survey described in this report, together with information drawn from the other cited sources, are as follows:

- Organization of Instruction

  Of those districts profiled in the study, 47 percent have a combination of separate and interdisciplinary instruction for FLE, and 37 percent use only an interdisciplinary method of instruction. Of the 47 percent that combine the two, most districts use a predominantly interdisciplinary course of instruction. Health education and, secondly, science are the most widely used vehicles for FLE instruction.

- Placement of FLE Instruction

  Most districts begin instruction in FLE in the lower primary grades and continue through grade 9 with a lessening of emphasis in later years.

- Instructional Practices

  Most districts emphasize the FLE areas of family relationships, personal growth and development, and social relations. This indicates that the districts not only closely follow the recommendations in the FLE guidelines, but they choose to place FLE in a context of interpersonal relationships. Significant numbers of districts do not perceive a need to improve their programs.

- Community Involvement

  A high degree of community involvement is indicated by the inclusion of parents and community in both curriculum development and as instructional resources in FLE. Most districts have gone beyond the minimal requirement.

- Staff Training

  More districts provide their own training, rather than acquiring it by other means. For slightly more than half, no training needs are reported. Training needs are reported for a variety of topics, including awareness and prevention of child abuse and neglect, curriculum development, and drugs and alcohol abuse, as well as training for new staff and retraining for continuing staff.

- Implementation Problems

  Most districts report no problems in implementing the curricula. Some districts, however, perceive problems of inadequate staff knowledge, lack of materials, and insufficient time for staff training.

- Curriculum Models

  Forty-six districts responded to a request for self-nomination, demonstrating fulfillment of established criteria. This indicates that substantial numbers of New Jersey districts have confidence in the quality and applicability of their own FLE programs and are willing to serve as models for other districts.

APPENDICES

A. Family Life Education Implementation Profile Form
B. Family Life Education Self-Nomination Form
C. Highlights of a National Association of State Board of Education Study

APPENDIX A

FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION IMPLEMENTATION PROFILE FORM

FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION IMPLEMENTATION PROFILE

District _____ County _____

Directions: This form is to be completed by staff of the County Office of Education. A separate form should be completed for each LEA in your county which has been monitored and for any additional districts for which you have information. It may be necessary to contact the LEA to supplement your existing information.

1. If the district is not in compliance, which of the following elements of the mandate is not in place?

___ Excusal policy and procedures
___ Curriculum
___ Annual notification of parents including curriculum outline, list of instructional materials, and availability of opportunity to review the complete curriculum
___ Community involvement in curriculum development

2. There are three probable program strategies for Family Life Education: either a Separate Program, an Interdisciplinary Program, or a combination of both across grades. Which approach is used in this district?

___ Separate Program
___ Interdisciplinary
___ Combination of the above

If you checked Interdisciplinary, check off those areas of the total curriculum into which Family Life Education has been integrated and the grade levels involved below. If you checked Separate Program, check off the grade levels involved below:

	K-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
___ Health	___	___	___	___
___ Science	___	___	___	___
___ Home Economics	___	___	___	___
___ Physical Education	___	___	___	___
___ Social Studies	___	___	___	___
___ Other _____	___	___	___	___
___ Separate Program	___	___	___	___

3. Please check off the grade levels at which the topic of Human Sexuality is taught:

___ K-3 ___ 4-6 ___ 7-9 ___ 10-12

4. Estimate the hours of FLE instruction per grade level per year.

K-3: _____ hours per year
4-6: _____ hours per year
7-9: _____ hours per year
10-12: _____ hours per year

5. Indicate the topics covered and the degree of emphasis given to each in the district:

FLE Topic	Degree of Emphasis (High 1	2	Low 3)	
Family relationships	1	2	3	
Personal growth and development	1	2	3	
Social relationships	1	2	3	
Sexuality	1	2	3	
Character education	1	2	3	
Problem-solving and decision-making	1	2	3	
Family violence/child abuse prevention	1	2	3	
Parenting skills	1	2	3	
Family planning	1	2	3	
Other: _____	1	2	3	
Other: _____	1	2	3	
Other: _____	1	2	3	

6. How is ongoing community involvement being achieved? Check off types of involvement and types of persons used as resources in the program:

Types of Involvement	Types of Persons
___ Curriculum development	___ Medical professionals
___ Resource persons for instruction	___ Social workers
	___ Counselors
	___ Others: _____

7. When was the most recent FLE training for staff? _____
   What topics were covered? _____
   Who conducted the program? _____
   Training needs now? _____

8. What problems, if any, are currently being encountered in this district in regard to Family Life Education?

   What, if anything, would improve the FLE program in this district?

Completed by: _____ Position: _____

APPENDIX B

FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION SELF-NOMINATION FORM

FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION SELF-NOMINATION FORM

District Name _____ County _____

Program Name (if applicable) _____

1. Approximate number of children participating: _____

2. Grade level of students participating: (Please check all grades that apply.)

___K ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 ___7 ___8 ___9 ___10 ___11 ___12

3. Is the Family Life Education (FLE) curriculum taught as: (Please check.)

___ a separate course of instruction?
___ an interdisciplinary course of instruction?
___ a combination of the above?

4. What alternative programming is provided for excused students?

5. Indicate the type(s) and frequency of inservice training and additional education provided for staff directly and indirectly involved with the FLE curriculum.

6. Please indicate (check) below the certification categories of teachers teaching FLE.

___ Biology
___ Comprehensive science
___ Elementary
___ Health education
___ Health and physical education
___ Others
___ Home economics
___ Nursery
___ School nurse
___ Teacher of psychology
___ Special education

7. Identify the key factors that you consider to be responsible for the successful implementation of your FLE curriculum.

8. Please indicate any unique qualities or characteristics of your program.

9. Review the enclosed descriptions of criteria. Indicate (check) the criteria that you have met.

Criteria Number

___ 1. Comprehensiveness in four required areas of the FLE mandate
___ 2. Variety of instructional strategies
___ 3. Logical scope and sequence of the curriculum
___ 4. Clarity and suitability of student outcomes
___ 5. Parent and community involvement
___ 6. Continuous inservice for teachers
___ 7. Evaluation component for FLE
___ 8. Ease of replication

10. If your curriculum does not meet all of the established criteria, please indicate the noteworthy qualities of your program which you wish to be considered.

Information Provided by: _____

Position: _____ Telephone: _____

PLEASE MAIL THIS COMPLETED FORM TO YOUR COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT BY OCTOBER 15, 1985. INCLUDE OTHER PERTINENT MATERIALS THAT WILL ASSIST US IN REVIEWING YOUR PROGRAM.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

APPENDIX C

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION STUDY

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION STUDY

The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) has undertaken a comprehensive examination of the development of the FLE mandate and the implementation of FLE in New Jersey schools, featuring a case study approach. A report of this study, Creating and Implementing Family Life Education in New Jersey (Lana Muraskin, in press), analyzed the state FLE mandate within historical, social, and political contexts and studied six school districts. While the number of district case studies is small, the findings and recommendations are valuable to understanding the status of implementation.

The study indicates that districts have two possible approaches to comply with the FLE mandate: 1) create a new program, or 2) review and incorporate FLE into the existing curriculum. Of the six districts studied, most followed the second approach, incorporating FLE at most grade levels.

The study found that human needs are taught in the elementary grades and human sexuality is taught in the later elementary years. The high school curriculum in human sexuality is mainly concerned with sexually transmitted diseases, contraception, pregnancy, and birth. This information concurs with the findings of the department survey. In general, the study found that:

> ...family life education is a combination of information about and discussion of values and attitudes toward 1) families: roles, responsibilities, types; 2) social problems: child abuse, divorce, drugs, alcohol, teenage pregnancy; 3) social and personal interaction: with parents, peers, the opposite sex, persons who are racially/culturally different; 4) the course of life: birth, growth, maturity, death; 5) family formation: marriage, children, financial planning; 6) the body: hygiene, disease, parts; and 7) sexuality: physical development, psychological development, reproduction, contraception, sexually transmitted disease, abuse and sexual partners. The one exception is Irvington, where family life education is sexuality education, almost entirely (Muraskin, in press).

Educational staff usually selected to teach FLE in the elementary grades are existing certified elementary teachers. In the later elementary grades, as the number of teachers with specialized certifications increases, the variety in certification increases. High school FLE instructors are usually certified in health or health and physical education. Once again, this concurs with the results of the department study.

MF/kv:1/2235j